

MAY 22, 1951

6:05 p.m. BROADCAST

Illinois U Library Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 287 Stations of the ABC Network



U.S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Are American Moral Standards in Public and Private Life Declining?

Guest Moderator, DR. ORVILLE HITCHCOCK

Speakers

CANON BERNARD IDDINGS BELL
T. V. SMITH



THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

on

**"What Do the Asian People Expect
of America?"**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 17, NUMBER 4



\$5.00 A YEAR; 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 17 No. 4



Are American Moral Standards in Public and Private Life Declining?

The Broadcast of May 22, 1951, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., EDT, over the American Broadcasting Company Network, originated at Lafayette, Indiana, under the auspices of Purdue University Convocations and Lectures.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

CANON BERNARD IDDINGS BELL—Canon of the Episcopal Church's Cathedral in Chicago; Educational Advisor to the Bishop of Chicago; Representative of the Episcopal Church to the University of Chicago. Educated at the University of Chicago, Canon Bell was President of St. Stephen's College and Professor of Philosophy at Columbia University. Among his numerous books, the best known are: *Beyond Agnosticism*, *Religion for Living*, *The Church in Disrepute*, *God is Not Dead*, *A Man Can Live*, and *Crisis in Education*. He has also written extensively for scholarly periodicals. A frequent broadcaster in this country and in England, Dr. Bell is commonly regarded as one of America's most original and challenging preachers. He has preached in scores of this country's leading pulpits, as well as at Westminster Abbey and twelve other British Cathedrals. He has been a preacher at many universities, including Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Cornell, Smith, Amherst, and Wellesley in America, McGill in Canada, and Oxford and Cambridge in England.

T. V. SMITH—Visiting Professor in Humanities at Tulane University; Maxwell Professor of Citizenship and Philosophy, Syracuse University; former member of the Illinois State Senate, 1935-38; and author. Starting his teaching career at Texas Christian University, where in 1916 he became a professor of English literature and philosophy, he then went on to teach at the University of Texas and the University of Chicago, where in 1922 he received his Ph.D. In 1943, he became a Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Army, and was active in the educational redirection programs for Italy, Germany and Japan. Formerly editor of the *International Journal of Ethics*, Mr. Smith's many books include: *The Democratic Way of Life*, *The Promise of American Politics*, *Democratic Tradition in America*, *Democracy and Dictatorship*, and *Atomic Power and Moral Faith*.

DR. ORVILLE HITCHCOCK—Professor of Speech at the State University of Iowa, Iowa City. Dr. Hitchcock was formerly associated with Town Hall as administrative assistant to George V. Denny, Jr., Moderator of "America's Town Meeting of the Air."

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 18, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1951, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

Are American Moral Standards in Public and Private Life Declining?

Announcer:

For the second time since 1947, America's Town Meeting tonight originates from the Hall of Music, one of the Nation's finest auditoriums, on the campus of Purdue University at Lafayette, Indiana. This program is a part of Purdue's lectures and Convocations for the current school term.

Purdue University, a state institution, had its beginning in 1869, when one of Indiana's pioneer citizens, John Purdue, presented to the State General Assembly a gift of \$200,000 and 150 acres of land. From this original 150-acre campus, Purdue has grown to nearly 10,000 acres and now has a student body of 10,000 young men and women. The university is perhaps best-known for its engineering school, which is the largest in the world in terms of undergraduate enrollment. It is with great pride that we originate Town Meeting from this campus.

And now to preside over tonight's discussion, in the absence of Mr. Denny, here is our guest moderator, Dr. Orville Hitchcock.

Moderator Hitchcock:

Good evening, friends. I am very happy to substitute as moderator tonight for my good friend George Denny. I wish that he were here, though, to share our pleasure in presenting America's Town Meeting from the beautiful Hall of Music on the Purdue University campus. We have here an enthusiastic student, faculty and town audience to listen to tonight's discussion.

This evening, folks, we are going to do some serious thinking about ourselves and about the public

officials who represent us. We raise a question which is most important in its own right and which is basic to many of the other great issues that confront us. This question is, "Are American Moral Standards in Public and Private Life Declining?" This is an issue which you and I have had vaguely in our minds since the days of World War II. Recently it has been sharpened and brought into focus by the Senate investigations of crime, by the basketball scandals, by the stories of political patronage and influence in Washington and elsewhere, and by our own observations of ourselves and our fellowmen.

The deep concern of prominent public officials like Senators Kefauver, Fulbright, and Ferguson has caused us to give serious attention to our ethical standards and to their relationship to our democracy and our way of life. So what we are going to do tonight is a little self-analysis, and it will be good for us. We ask whether moral standards are really any lower today than they have been, or whether we are just now becoming worried enough about our conduct to want to do something to improve it. Can we secure public morality through legislation and codes? Are we lacking in the spiritual values which give us a basis for ethical living?

For answers to these and other important questions we are going to consult two very able speakers who have given this matter much thought: Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell and Dr. T. V. Smith. First, we shall hear from Dr. Bell, Canon of the Episcopal Cathedral in Chicago, consultant on education to

the Bishop of Chicago, and author of many books, including *Crisis in Education*. Dr. Bell, do you think our moral standards are getting worse or better?

Dr. Bell:

Ladies and gentlemen, whether the moral standards of America today are deteriorating or improving is a question about which there is possibility of legitimate difference. My own conviction is that standards have definitely gone down. Yes, American life in the past has been scandalous enough. Look at those imperialistic grabs—the Mexican War, the Spanish-American War—and look at the scandals of President Harding's Administration or that of President McKinley or that of President Grant.

There have always been in this country, whoremongers, adulterers, thieves, liars and two-timers. But against them has been arrayed a common realization that certain things are right and certain other things are wrong. Nowadays, for the most part, Americans ask of a contemplated act or policy little more than, "Does it pay in immediate animal satisfaction?" and "Can I get away with it?" We forget that there are other questions to ask which are more important.

Now, this is new and portentous. It is not merely that our people do bad things and leave good things undone. More important is the fact that Americans as a whole have forgotten what constitutes truly human living.

The overwhelming majority of ethical scientists down the ages agree that man is always torn between animal impulses, on the one hand, and on the other, peculiarly human hungers—hungers for the pursuit of truth, the creation of

beauty, the exercise of goodness in the shape of loving without demanding to be loved. And if people forget these human hungers and live cheaply for possessions, for applause, for sensory excitements and amusements, for competition in respect to power, society becomes dangerous and self-destructive.

The truly human life consists, first, in craftsmanship—the attempt to do what we have to do as beautifully as possible and just for the joy of it; and second, in loving, which consists in regarding other people as more important and more interesting than oneself.

Now, if this be true, it is difficult to deny that American moral standards in private and public life are declining perilously, for we no longer feel obliged to make an effort to be craftsmen and lovers. We tend to become a nation of super-efficient anthropoids with a morality of expedient compromises, and this is new in America.

What makes us content to pursue only animal ends and forget the human ends? First, thanks to the enlargement of wealth, the lately emancipated common man—which is most of us—now has at his disposal opportunities for animal satisfactions which, because they are new in his experience, seem to him more important than the experience of the race has shown them to be.

This overavidity for possessions and pleasures and power is aided by our mass media of communication—the newspapers and magazines, a glut of vulgar books, the radio, and television. These hammer home to us the importance of things materialistic, animalistic, trivial and subhuman—things which are not wrong in themselves but definitely harmful once

Don't forget that there are things to pursue more important and more fully human.

And American advertising, too, for its own ends—the sale of goods in large quantity and the making of profits—also appeals to the animal in man and almost never appeals to the more than animal. And all this has had and still has such an evil effect upon our moral standards as our fathers never dreamed of.

And in the second place, our public educational system fails to bring us face to face with our human destiny. Our schools are in some respect wonderful, but they are not for the most part encouraging or even permitting growing youth to ask, "What is the good life for man, as man through the ages has come to understand it?" Now, given a school system which ignores the problem of what constitutes the good life and also a series of daily pressures which bid us live as beasts and little more, a nation is sure to arrive in a dangerous state of ignorance about the things that matter to that nation. In the light of these considerations, I do maintain that the moral state of this country is more dangerous than at any former period in its history. Thank you.

Hitchcock:

Thank you, Dr. Bell. Now for another point of view, we turn to Dr. T. V. Smith, currently visiting professor at Tulane University, on leave from Syracuse University, where he is Maxwell Professor of Citizenship and Philosophy. A late book of Professor Smith's is entitled *Atomic Power and Moral Responsibility*. What's your opinion of the moral conduct of the American people, Dr. Smith?

Dr. Smith:

My grand-dad, viewing earth's worn cogs,
Said things were going to the dogs;
His grand-dad, in his house of logs,
Said things were going to the dogs;
His grand-dad, in his Flemish bogs,
Said things were going to the dogs.

There's one thing which I have to state:

The dogs have had a good long wait!

Without doubt, ladies and gentlemen, the postwar period is not exactly the best time to show off a nation's morals. But if you insist upon the present showdown, the come-off does not strike me as bad as it was following the War Between the States, with its "gilded age" in the North and its impoverishment of the South. Nor as bad, indeed, as after the First World War with the Ohio gallants singing under the eaves of the White House, "Hail, hail, the gang's all here." The Missouri Blues are better music than that.

But why take on vices when our virtues are so vast? Humanity is tougher than moral medicine men ever think. It can stand a lot of sinning and yet show up gaily at its own funeral. Even though, "Man, however, well-behaved,
At best be but a monkey shaved."

still there is all around us a quiet resolution not read of in newspapers and daily devotion to duty unsung in grand opera.

If there be any joy in life, if there be any confidence in our peers, if there be stamina for historic deeds, if there be courage

and magnanimity, then, Canon Bell, let us think on these things.

I myself like a nation that can turn enemies into friends, war into peace, and peace into progress. I like a nation that can invent the mighty bomb and then contain it, offering to share it with all peaceful men. I like a nation that can calculate the risks of living and then take them with a toss of the head. I like America here, now, as is.

Morals must be made of stuff sterner than exquisiteness, or preciousity, or preoccupation with purity grown pathological. Morals are morale, and morale is production and equality of opportunity and strong defense. Speak, then, to me of national production, and you will no longer mince your words. International prowess—speak to me of that, and I will lend you both my ethical ears. Sing to me again the melody of evolving justice, which is America.

Is production declining? No. Is defense neglected? No. Has justice lost its political sex appeal? No. These, you see, ladies and gentlemen, are moral matters of unquestioned magnitude. They surmount mere morbidities. They transcend pieties. They adapt to morale. I myself worry, you see, more about things like skill and pride in skill, than about sin and its indictment.

Just recently, as I was reaching a low in this regard, I got a great lift in New Orleans—last month it was—from an automobile mechanic who taught me to say what I now ask you to intone: "Who works with his hands is a laborer; who works with his hands and brain is a craftsman; but who works with his hands, brain, and heart is an artist."

Give me workmen like that and soldiers like these Purdue men in

Korea, and I will ride the storm calm over any moral declivity which Canon Bell decries, and confident of the continuing Korea justice, though our moral mentors may continue to rage over our continuing wickedness.

Dr. Hitchcock:

Thank you, Dr. Smith. Now, before we take questions from this large Purdue University audience, let's have some comments from our speakers. Dr. Bell, I imagine that you didn't quite agree with everything that Dr. Smith said. Is that right? Would you like to ask him a question?

Dr. Bell: I'd be pleased to ask him a question or two. However, I don't know whether I can devastate him, because he's hard to devastate.

Dr. Smith: Ask me three, then, Canon Bell.

Dr. Bell: All right, maybe that will work. Dr. Smith, you have said some very wonderful things about how good our Nation and its people really are. Then how do you explain the fact that in this time of crisis, with our Nation's back to the wall, our future in peril, and the whole world in danger, all of the classes in America are more concerned with feathering their own nests than with promoting the common welfare?

So eminent a man as Mr. Ford has lately declared that you cannot expect any American business to go on producing unless it gets "its normal profits." Labor will not work unless it gets constantly increasing pay for constantly decreasing labor. The farmers will not produce food unless they are bribed with exorbitant prices, and the result of all this is that the Nation is approaching inflation, a

inous inflation such as will be
inous not only to labor but also
business and also to agriculture
d also to all of us, such an in-
tion as has already deprived this
untry by increased costs of over
e-quarter of all the arms and
munition that we thought we
re going to get to fight our
ttles with. Now this seems to
self-seeking gone mad. How
es it fit in with your picture of a
adamentally altruistic people?

Dr. Smith: Canon Bell, that isn't
question. That's a very eloquent
ech.

deny the allegation and defy
allegator. It seems to me that
you've asked there is why are
man beings human beings, not
y morals are declining. Because
at you attribute here to labor,
at you attribute here to Amer-
business, what you attribute
American farmers is exactly
at you and I as professors prac-
every day. We want to be
d for our work, and we want
live well. Let's not be disin-
uous about this business. This
what business is for—to make,
Mr. Ford said, its normal profit.
s is what labor is for: to enjoy
craftsmanship, as you put it,
and I, its skill, but at the same
e, to make a living at it.

these are not things to be depre-
d, unless our standpoint is
ven, and we still remain on
n. In fact, that question, Canon
makes me think really that
have despaired of getting us
heaven your way, so you're
g to surrender us all to hell
own way.

Dr. Bell: Having listened to that
interesting rejoinder, I can
say that I think that probably
ree that we are all going to
our own way, along with Dr.

Smith as chief defender of it.
(*Laughter*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Dr. Smith, I
wonder if you wouldn't like to ask
a question now of Dr. Bell.

Dr. Smith: Dr. Bell, a student
gave me this scriptural quotation
and wanted me to ask it of you.
He wanted you to comment, give
an exegesis, if you will, upon this
scriptural quotation. "Where moral
declivity doth abound, moral
ascendancy doth much more
abound."

Dr. Bell: Yes, I suppose that
when the whole of a people starts
going to hell very fast, there are
bound to be some people who
get so disgusted that they start
being moral. That's what you
mean, I suppose?

Dr. Smith: Canon Bell is a very
skillful evader. He doesn't give
an exegesis even of the Scriptures
here. I thought he would.

Dr. Bell: Well, I shouldn't think
that it was at all necessary. I don't
know where the Scripture comes
from. I never heard of it. I'm quite
sure it isn't Scripture.

Dr. Smith: I want to read the
Canon, if I might, a little quota-
tion here. "It is a gloomy moment
in history. Not for many years,
not in the lifetime of most men
who read this paper, has there
been so much grave and deep ap-
prehension. Never has the future
seemed so incalculable as at this
time. In France, the political caul-
dron seethes and bubbles with un-
certainty. Russia hangs as usual like
a cloud dark and silent upon the
horizon of Europe, while all the
energies, resources, and influences
of the British Empire are sorely
tried and are yet to be tried more
sorely. It is a solemn moment, and
no man can feel indifference, which
happily no man pretends to feel. Of

our own troubles, no man can see the end." Guess when that was written, Canon Bell?

Dr. Bell: I think, as I recall the quotation—which has been very widely quoted—I think it was back about the time of the Revolution, or a little after it. I can only say in regard to it—I've forgotten who it was that said it, or what paper—that if those people who said that in those times, well, if they lived today, they would say, "We didn't see nothing before." (*Applause*)

Dr. Smith: This is from *Harper's Weekly* in 1857. We're not debating here tonight whether or not there are immoralities. There always are, always have been, and always will be. We're not debating whether there are impieties. We're debating whether or not we are getting worse. Why pick on our generation and deprecate the one generation that we know? The past is inexorable. The future is inscrutable. The present alone is calculable. Why deprecate the present?

Dr. Bell: Well, I didn't frame the question that's put for discussion here, and neither did you, Dr. Smith. We got it from the Town Meeting of the Air. I never would have put the question myself. It seems to me a false question.

Dr. Hitchcock: I want to assure you, gentlemen, that I'm not picking on our present generation. Dr. Bell, do you come fortified with another question?

Dr. Bell: Yes, I think I have another one. You've been teaching a long time in various universities for a good many years. I suppose that you have really come to know American undergraduates pretty well. Does it impress you that the

American undergraduate is really very much interested, as much interested as his fathers and grandfathers would have been, in the question of what constitutes the good life, or in anything much except his own material advancement and the aggrandizement of American prestige?

Dr. Smith: Well, I don't know the undergraduates you're speaking of, sir. I'm not fiscal advisor to the Bishop. But speaking for myself, I do not recognize these undergraduates of whom you speak. It seems to me that every generation that I've dealt with them, they have been more serious, more concerned with the good life and more inclined to wave aside what legitimately might be called selfish interests in the interest of the common good which is training them and in which they are training for future service. Those are the undergraduates I know.

Dr. Bell: Yes. You were at the University of Chicago once, I think Mr. Smith.

Dr. Smith: Even there, sir. (*Laughter*)

Dr. Hitchcock: Gentlemen, wonder if I may break in here to ask a question of you. I wish the radio audience could see these two gentlemen, planted shoulder to shoulder in front of the microphone, each refusing to budge an inch to the other. But let me ask a question. Our Town Meeting listeners will remember that on April 3 we asked them to send in their reactions to two questions: "What feelings did the Kefauver investigation arouse in you, and what do you think the outcome of this investigation should be?" Now you people sent us many letters and cards in reply, and these answers were analyzed by Dr. Ernest

Dichter, eminent social psychologist.* He discovered that 60% of you praised the work of the Kefauver committee, but that only 10% of you expressed shock and surprise on learning the facts brought to light by the investigation. Now, what I would like to ask our speakers tonight is, "Do these figures give you any concern?" These are the opinions of our Town Meeting listeners.

Dr. Smith: Yes, of course, they give me concern, as I know they do Canon Bell, but they are not without explanations, and I do not see in them whatsoever any reason for indicting this generation as being worse than any generation that has gone before it. I would like, if I wanted to give my own explanation of them, many reasons for thinking that we have become more aware of the difficulties in which we function and much more inclined to expose our own hypocracies, rather than take them seriously and not therefore get morbid over things that have always been, are now, and will always be. I think that's what it reflects.

Dr. Hitchcock: Dr. Bell, you have a different point of view?

Dr. Bell: Not very. For once he and I agree pretty well. I do think so. There is one encouraging thing about the reaction to the Kefauver investigation. Nobody was very much surprised, because whatever may be our moral defects today, we're not given to making scapegoats out of our politicians. We do realize that the thing which produces the politicians, is us, and that the kind of people that we put in office, acting in so many cases and prominent cases in these outrageous

coalitions with gangsterdom, really represents a good deal of what our own attitude is. I was particularly struck watching people—including young people, very young people, high school people—listening to the television reports of those investigations, and I found that there wasn't any great indignation against the gangsters or the corrupt politicians, but there was a kind of envy, as though, "Well, we're all rotten, but these people get some publicity out of it."

Dr. Smith: I think that latter jab is rather unfair against a general statement. What I mean in saying that we have become much more aware of our normal hypocracies and less inclined to presume upon them is this: We all know that we aren't going to give up gambling. We never have given up gambling, and we aren't thinking of giving it up now. We aren't thinking of giving it up in the future, in many, many senses, of taking risks. Well, now we know that, and we aren't going to pretend that we don't know it any longer, but we're mixed up. We see that the gambling impulses of man have been turned to very bad accounts in corrupting politics and so forth. But we also see that just as we get large-scale business and large-scale government, the enlargement of the scale on which gambling itself is done involves great difficulties which we have yet to learn how to do. But we're not going to deny that we're interested in gambling, because as yet we haven't learned how to control the large-scale incidents of what, on the other side, constitutes the great benefits of our organized life.

Dr. Bell: In regard to gambling, of course, I gamble, and I don't see any harm in it, nor does the Christian Church in its theology,

*Free copies of Dr. Dichter's complete report are available. See page 13 for details.

down through the ages. Gambling is quite all right, provided you don't risk more than you can afford to lose. But the trouble that has been brought out by this Kefauver investigation is not that people gamble. It is that our whole political structure is subjected to bribery on the part of gamblers and other disreputable people to such an extent as nearly to destroy our security. That's the real

trouble. I think that in the reaction to the Kefauver investigation, most people were not surprised because they know things are rotten, even if Mr. Smith doesn't.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you very much, Dr. Smith and Dr. Bell, for this interesting discussion around the microphone. Now we are ready to take questions from our large audience here on the Purdue University campus.

★

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Lady: Dr. Bell, is this national crisis due to the morals or have the morals caused the national crisis?

Dr. Bell: Have the bad morals caused the crisis or did the crisis cause bad morals? Sort of a question of the hen and the egg, I think. They play into one another's hands. I think that I would be inclined to say that the moral defect of our people produces the crisis, and not wholly, of course, because crises arrive in modern big-scale organization often without much individual responsibility at all. But I should say that I think that the morals cause the crisis far more than the crisis causes the decay in morals.

Man: Dr. Smith, doesn't the current clamor for "security" rather than freedom signify a decline in public morality?

Dr. Smith: I don't think so. It changes the locus and nature of public morality, but we all want all the security we can get, compatible with a minimum amount of liberty which we have, and I see nothing immoral in that.

Man: Dr. Bell, would you lay the blame for our seeming moral

decline upon our public and religious educational systems?

Dr. Bell: Well, I think partly so. I suggested two reasons for it. One of them is that the amount of opportunity for living as on an animal basis is greatly increased by our modern inventions and so on. And the other, I said, was that our public education does not impart to growing children a willingness seriously to consider what the ends of life are. I don't mean that they are taught bad ends of life. They just for the most part aren't taught any morals at all, except the kind of expedient morals: "You mustn't lie because if you do it will get you into trouble. You mustn't steal because that would upset things." But they are not taught to face fundamental moral issues. Why am I alive? Unless I know why I am alive and what the purpose of my existence is, I can only drift with the tide. Our public school system notoriously does not bring children, growing children, face to face with this fundamental problem of what constitutes a good satisfactory and significant life. It is its greatest

fect, and I think that as long as that goes on there will be trouble. Now, of course, the real trouble the schools won't face it is that they know perfectly well that the moral problem is fundamentally a religious problem. It has to do with the question of whether there are absolute standards determined, not by human beings, but by the nature of things, which are to be obeyed. Now if that's introduced into the school system, we have trouble and differences of opinion, and so the school system just ignores the question, and I think, it is largely responsible.

Dr. Smith: It makes me think that Dr. Bell never went to an American public school, but to the sort of private school. I think this is so grossly unfair—that he said in the beginning that the American public school must be replied to, for as far as literature is taught in all its forms—which is the embodiment of the best moral thought of the ages—and as long as the moral studies are taught, as they are in our generation as they never have been taught before—how can we live together, what they owe to each other, the meaning of sportsmanship—so long as that remains true, and it is truer today than ever before in the American public schools, this is a tribute upon public education in the name of some esoteric source which cannot conceivably be identified as a monopoly with the teaching of morality. (*Applause*) I will remind you that the two great symbols of the spiritual life in America and throughout the world were Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, neither of whom in principle would ever identify

himself with a church as the foundation for a moral life.

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Dr. Smith. Yes, we want to let Dr. Bell in for just a second before we take our next question.

Dr. Bell: All right. I just want to say this. I didn't come here to have an argument about the merits or demerits of religion, and I refuse to do so for Mr. Smith, no matter how insulting he gets. All right, that's that. (*Applause*)

Now in defense of myself, I will say that I started my education in the public school system of Dayton, Ohio, and I finished it in the grammar school and high school of the City of Chicago. I didn't go to a state university, and perhaps that may be held against me, but at least I am a product of public education, and I have been, in one capacity or another, connected with it most of my life, and the things I'm saying to you about public education or, I am saying not on my own authority, but with the backing of countless teachers and countless people who are disturbed about this thing. Anybody that thinks the American public school has no faults to it and especially that it has no fault in teaching the moral life is talking apart from the books, so far as educators themselves go. (*Applause*)

Lady: How can you argue that our morals are not declining, in the face of our high divorce rate and subsequent downfall of our family life, Dr. Smith?

Dr. Smith: Canon Bell, no insult is given when none is intended. I only see that you don't know anything about the public school today. You knew about it

long ago. It has faults, yes, of course, but it is not fair to teachers of literature and social sciences not to see the tremendous moral import of what they are doing better and better every year.

As touching the divorce rate, this also is a very moot question, of course. It is arguable on the one side that it is better to have self-respecting divorce than it is to have unself-respecting marriage. And I would not, therefore, put down the divorce rate as altogether an evil. It is a good with its bad side, which needs more and more to be explored, but it is not adequate ground on which to enter an indictment of the present generation, or of the honest men and women who prefer this type of a moral life.

Man: Dr. Bell, if morals are declining, should they be raised in our educational institutions, our churches or our homes, and how do you propose to do it?

Dr. Bell: Well, I think we had better start raising them everywhere we get a chance to. Certainly, our educational institutions need some raising in moral standards. I've been connected in my time with three great universities and two small colleges, and I assure you that the moral attitudes and conduct of the faculty of those institutions was not anything to write home about. The home, of course, is the chief moral teacher, and one of the chief things the matter with our system is that the parents no longer try to teach their children morals, but dump them off on the school system and say, "You make good boys and girls out of them." It can't be done.

Man: Dr. Smith, does not Government action in leading the younger generation to expect some-

thing for nothing show deterioration?

Dr. Smith: I don't recognize the Government of which you are speaking, sir, that teaches people to expect something for nothing. I know not only my own opinion about this, but the remark of a very severe critic of American life and of Congress, Charles A. Beard, who said, "I am convinced that for disinterestedness, absence of corruption, and concern with the public good, the present body," which was the 76th Congress, "is of higher order than the first congresses of the United States."

Again, why do we insist on throwing off on our generation, when it's all we have, even our politics and politicians?

Man: Dr. Bell, can moral standards be measured by any other criterion than the Word of God?

Dr. Bell: Yes, they can be measured other ways. I don't think that the results are much different whichever way you measure them, but they can be measured by the question of whether they work or not. Perhaps many of you read Mr. Toynbee's *Meaning of History*. If you have, you will see that this very eminent historian, by the study of history itself, goes to show that when nations begin to live for animal ends, instead of human ends, they die. So you can find out, from the experience of the past, what will work and what will not work. You find, when you do that, that the evidence of history is startlingly like the revelation of God as recorded in the Bible, or the revelation of God as recorded in any of the great religious literatures of the world.

Man: Dr. Smith, Dr. Kinsey in his study of the male sex habits reports an unbelievably high per-

tage of sexual immorality. Does it not indicate a decline of public morality within our Nation?

Dr. Smith: Well, perhaps it is, somewhat, but it may indicate only a great ignorance of what has gone on before. And knowledge of what goes on today is not that.

again want to make the main point. It seems to me that it's a little late enough for man to repair the pair of mankind. It's always a little premature for a human being to deprecate the human race. Why throw off on the present generation?

Man: Dr. Bell, do you see any hope for improvement in the present state of public morality?

Dr. Bell: Yes, I do, because things are getting worse and worse, and when they get worse long enough, people get sick of it, and then they get "betterer."

Dr. Hitchcock: Thank you very much, Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell and Dr. T. V. Smith, for this stimulating discussion.

Plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.



CRIME REPORT AVAILABLE FREE

At the end of the April 3 broadcast on the subject "How should We Deal With Organized Crime?" Town Meeting listeners were invited to send their answers to the following questions:

1. How do you feel about the revelations of the Kefauver Committee?
2. What do you think should be the real results of the Kefauver Committee investigations?

The replies were studied by Dr. Ernest Dichter, well-known psychologist, who has just completed his revealing analysis of America's reaction to the crime investigations. It is one thing to know our views on these questions, but it is equally important for every alert citizen to know what the rest of the nation is thinking. Dr. Dichter's findings are "must" reading for every civic leader and for everyone who is deeply concerned about the crime situation.

You may have a free copy of the complete report by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Department D, Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Now that you have read the opinions of both speakers on the subject, "Are American Moral Standards in Public and Private Life Declining?" you are probably ready to draw your own conclusions. Before doing so, however, you may want to consider the following background questions.

-
- ★
1. What do the recent investigations of crime, basketball, 5 percenters, the R.F.C., and political patronage indicate about American moral standards?
 - a. Do they indicate that our standards are declining or that people are becoming concerned enough about morality to do something about it?
 - b. Are our standards declining, or do we expect too much of human nature?
 2. Are moral standards any lower at present than they have been in the past?
 - a. If so, how do you account for this fact when interest in religion is being revived?
 - b. Is there any relationship between religion and morals?
 3. Is morality identical with legality, as Senator Fulbright questioned in his statement to the Senate last month?
 - a. How should we deal with officials who operate within the letter of the law, but who violate the spirit of the law?
 4. Do we need a code of standards for public officials similar to the codes of the legal and medical professions?
 - a. If so, what standards should be set?
 - b. Have codes of standards in the professions mentioned eliminated improper actions by lawyers and doctors?
 5. Can moral standards and actions be raised by legislations or codes of behavior?
 - a. If not, how can moral standards be improved?
 - b. Do our schools teach and emphasize the wrong values?
 - c. What is the role of the church and the family?
 6. Are we lacking in the spiritual values which give us a basis for living?
 - a. Are people any worse than they ever were?
 7. What is the effect of our movies, radio and television programs, newspapers, and current literature on morals?
 - a. Is it the purpose of mass media of communication to improve the nation's morals?
 8. Do we need a moral rearmament movement such as has started in Germany?

THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

"WHAT DO THE ASIAN PEOPLE EXPECT OF AMERICA?"

Program of May 15, 1951

Speakers

J. Singh

Norman Cousins

Col. Ben C. Limb



Each week we print as many significant comments on the preceding Tuesday's broadcast as space allows. You are invited to send in your opinions, pro and con, no later than Thursday following the program. It is understood that we may publish any letters or comments received.



DRALS & MACHIAVELLI

Having been a teacher of history and government for thirteen years, I have repeatedly told my students and friends that the key to our future was in China and India. Although I have been out of the teaching profession for over a decade, I still believe it. I, therefore, am grateful to Norman Cousins for his analysis of the situation in these two countries and of his recommendations for our country. I regret that it has become necessary for a man such as Mr. Singh to accuse our country of falling away from our ideals and moral principles and of possibly adopting the Machiavellian policy in our diplomatic decisions. I hope the real American citizens will soon demand that our government return to policies and actions which will leave no doubt, either in this country or abroad, as to our moral integrity. The time has come when we must courageously take a stand; we cannot, for instance, successfully woo both France and French China at the same time. Whether we are being fooled, and the world loses prestige by attempting to do so.—MRS. HERBERT H. SCHAKEL, Ellettsville, Wayne, Indiana.

THE GREAT DEBATE OF 1898

I am tempted to criticize your speakers . . . for omitting . . . the one big point in history that gave the greatest impetus to the hopes of the world's down-trodden . . . the issue that was settled by the Spanish-American War . . . (and) gave all Asia cause to look up to the United States as their possible future benefactor. They have been looking forward to independence such as we provided for the Philippines. . . . Following the great debate on imperialism . . . (President McKinley) concluded that he had but one course to follow and that was to take temporary control over the Philippines and its people and to establish a protectorate for such period of time as might be necessary to develop the necessary capacity for self-government, and that they should then be liberated. . . . The winning of the war brought about the recognition of the United States as a world power and gave cause to all subject peoples to look forward to the time when we could, and would, give each of them moral support, or more, in their struggle for independence.—LEROY JONES, Old Albuquerque, New Mexico.

GRAIN TO INDIA

Russia's sending the small amount (of grain) in comparison with what is needed made such favorable propaganda for the Communists. Our humanitarian instinct should have prompted us to send grain immediately, not just do it to avoid unfavorable publicity. I read that even though we had not agreed to send the large amount asked, that we were shipping some to India right along. I wonder if that is true. — MRS. BESSIE T. KENCH, Storm Lake, Iowa.

The discussion did not once bring to light the fact that the United States is already shipping to India one hundred thousand tons of grain monthly. . . . I did not expect the representative of India to speak up, but that so large an audience of Americans should be one hundred percent ignorant is incredible. — A. W. CHAMBERS, Baltimore, Maryland.

[Although there was insufficient time during the broadcast to comment on American grain shipments to India, last week's Bulletin contained a supplemental note by Norman Cousins, stating that American shipments to India in April totaled 295,000 long tons, and that the shipments for March, April, and May are expected to total between 800,000 and 900,000 tons.—Ed.]

TURNABOUT

Can the American people do what other peoples expect of us? . . . In all the talks I have heard and in all the printing I have read on this subject of aid to other countries, the question is always "What do other countries expect of the U.S.A.?" Not one word have I heard about any concern for the 60 to 65 millions of American workers who are "expected" to do this and that for other countries. Are we 60 to 65 million working Americans expected to foot the bills for aid to 200 millions, 400 million, or perhaps a billion other people in other lands in addition to working for the support of about 90 million non-working Americans? . . . Isn't it about time to start checking up on the ledger and see where we stand and how much more we can stand? . . . Or are we to drift along on a happy-go-lucky wave of emotionalism until we suddenly find ourselves plunging over the financial falls to economic death? If this is isolationism (which it is decidedly *not* in my judgment) then I, as (an) American worker am a 100% isolationist and proud of it. So I repeat: Can the American people do what is expected of us? —G. P. KURTZ, Cleveland, Ohio.

Perhaps this broadcast is of vital interest to a club or organization in which you are interested. Bulk orders can be filled at a very reasonable cost. Write:

America's Town Meeting of the Air
123 West 43rd Street, New York 18, N.Y.